

Rachael D. Lamkin (SBN 246066)  
Karan Singh Dhadialla (SBN 296313)  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
101 California Street, Suite 3200  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Phone: (415) 291-6200  
Fax: (415) 291-6300  
rachael.lamkin@bakerbotts.com  
karan.dhadialla@bakerbotts.com

*Attorneys for Defendant NETFLIX, INC.*

*Additional counsel listed on signature page*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**OAKLAND DIVISION**

LAURI VALJAKKA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
NETFLIX, INC.,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. 4:22-cv-01490-JST

**DEFENDANT NETFLIX, INC.'S REPLY IN  
SUPPORT OF OPPOSED MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO AMEND ITS ANSWER TO  
ADD A SINGLE CUVTA  
COUNTERCLAIM**

Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar  
Date: September 21, 2023  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Crtrm: 6 – 2nd Floor

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

There is good cause to modify the scheduling order and grant Netflix leave to amend its answer to add a single counterclaim for a violation of the California Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (“CUVTA”). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, 16(b).

In response to Netflix’s Motion for Leave to Amend its Answer to Add a Single CUVTA Counterclaim (Dkt. 128), Plaintiff Lauri Valjakka (“Valjakka”) filed a 2-page Opposition (Dkt. 141) that is identical to his other opposition (Dkt. 142) to Netflix’s Motion for Leave to Amend the Scheduling Order to Allow Minimal, Targeted CUVTA Discovery. Valjakka did not address the applicable factors, and simply disputes that CUVTA applies to the transfers at issue, *i.e.*, the merits. Dkt. 141 at 2–3. The ample factual and legal basis as to why CUVTA applies to the transfers at issue is explained in detail in Netflix’s proposed counterclaim (Dkt. 128, Ex. A), its motion for a preliminary injunction (Dkt. 127), and its concurrently-filed reply in support of the motion for a preliminary injunction, and therefore is not repeated here.

As discussed in Netflix’s Motion for Leave to Amend its Answer to Add a Single CUVTA Counterclaim (Dkt. 128), there is good cause to allow Netflix to add the CUVTA claim under Rule 16(b), and Netflix’s proposed amendment is proper under Rule 15(a).

First, “Rule 16(b)’s ‘good cause’ standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” *Strickland v. Ujiri*, No. 20-CV-981-YGR, 2020 WL 5530076, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2020) (quoting *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)). The record regarding Netflix’s diligence is amply set forth in its Motions to Amend The Scheduling Order and Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (Dkts. 127, 128, 129). Valjakka does not contest Netflix’s diligence.

Second, Rule 15 specifies that “[t]he court should freely give leave when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). “Under Rule 15(a), ‘[t]he four factors commonly used to determine the propriety of a motion for leave to amend are bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, and futility of amendment.’” *Id.* (quoting *Abels v. JBC Legal Group, P.C.*, 229 F.R.D. 152, 155-56 (N.D. Cal. 2005)). “According to the Ninth Circuit, ‘the crucial factor is the resulting prejudice to the opposing party,’ and the burden of showing that prejudice is on the party opposing

amendment.” *PNC Bank, N.A. v. Smith*, No. 2:10-CV-1916-JAM-EFB, 2013 WL 3155013, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. June 18, 2013) (quoting *Howey v. United States*, 481 F.2d 1187, 1190 (9th Cir. 1973)). Valjakka does not argue that Netflix acted in bad faith or delayed bringing its CUVTA claim. Nor does he argue that he would be prejudiced by allowing Netflix to amend to add a CUVTA counterclaim. *See PNC Bank, N.A. v. Smith*, No. 2:10-CV-1916-JAM-EFB, 2013 WL 3155013, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. June 18, 2013) (granting motion for leave to file proposed counterclaims even though the case had been “pending for over two and a half years,” because “plaintiff has not shown that permitting [defendant] to add her counterclaims will prolong this case”).

For the foregoing reasons, Netflix respectfully requests that the Court amend the scheduling order to allow Netflix to amend its answer and add a counterclaim under CUVTA.

Dated: September 7, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rachael D. Lamkin

Rachael D. Lamkin (SBN 246066)  
Karan Singh Dhadialla (SBN 296313)  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
101 California Street, Suite 3200  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: (415) 291-6200  
Fax: (415) 291-6300  
rachael.lamkin@bakerbotts.com  
karan.dhadialla@bakerbotts.com

Sarah E. Piepmeier, Bar No. 227094  
SPiepmeier@perkinscoie.com  
Elise S. Edlin, Bar No. 293756  
EEdlin@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
505 Howard Street, Suite 1000  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: +1.415.344.7000  
Facsimile: +1.415.344.7050

Janice L. Ta (appearance pro hac vice)  
JTa@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
405 Colorado Street Suite 1700  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Telephone: +1.737.256.6100

Facsimile: +1.737.256.6300

Jassiem N. Moore (appearance pro hac vice)  
JassiemMoore@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099  
Telephone: +1.206.359.8000  
Facsimile: +1.206.359.9000

Brianna Kadjo, Bar No. 303336  
BKadjo@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
1900 Sixteenth Street, Suite 1400  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5255  
Telephone: +1.303.291.2300  
Facsimile: +1.303.291.2400

*Attorneys For Defendant NETFLIX, INC.*